DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 158 TE 002 559

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Buggs, Mary Jo |
| TITLE | The WSU-Stevens Point Freshman Composition Project. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Wisconsin State Universities Consortium of Research Development, Stevens Point. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research. |
| BUREAU NO | BR-6-2728-3 |
| PUB DATE | May 69 |
| GRANT | OEG-3-6-062728-2129 |
| NOTE | 23p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Composition (Literary), *Composition Skills (Literary), *English Instruction, *Hypothesis Testing, Test Results, *Tests |

ABSTRACT

This project was designed to test the hypothesis that "variation in quantity of practice in writing, when all other relevant factors are held constant, will result in variation of ability to write." Writing was limited to expository writing, and the factors held constant were quality of instruction, ability of students, and evaluation procedures on written materials. Fifteen freshman English sections were included in the experiment. These were divided into three groups of five sections each: the minimal writing group, the average writing group, and the maximum writing group. To determine the writing ability of the students as the project began and to determine the change in ability at the end, two tests were used: Form 1A of the Cooperative English Tests and Form X-35 of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development: Test 3, Correctness and Appropriateness of Expression. Ten essays per student were also evaluated. A comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores on the Iowa Test revealed no constant pattern of change within any of the three groups. A comparison of the scores on the Cooperative English Test revealed that the difference between the pre-test and post-test means was significantly larger beyond the 1/10% level for all three groups. The overall conclusion is that writing practice increases writing ability. (Author/CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

3
WSU-CORD

**The Wisconsin State Universities Consortium of Research Development**

ED054158

# Research Report

## THE WSU-STEVENS POINT FRESHMAN COMPOSITION PROJECT

Mary Jo Buggs
Wisconsin State University - Stevens Point
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

TE 002 559

**Cooperative Research**

**Wisconsin State Universities**
**and the**
**United States Office of Education**
**Bureau of Research - Higher Education**

**Office of the Director WSU-CORD**
**240 Main Building**
**Wisconsin State University**
**Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481**

ED054158

FINAL REPORT

WSU-CORD
The Consortium of Research Development
Of The
Wisconsin State Universities

Project No. 760-541-70-1007-06
Grant No. 3-6-062728-2129
Local Project No. 3

# THE WSU-STEVENS POINT FRESHMAN COMPOSITION PROJECT

Mary Jo Buggs
Wisconsin State University
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

May 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FINAL REPORT

WSU-CORD
The Consortium of Research Development
Of The
Wisconsin State Universities

# THE WSU-STEVENS POINT FRESHMAN COMPOSITION PROJECT

Wisconsin State University
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

May 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS


SECTION PAGE

Acknowledgements . . . . . .

Summary . . . . . 1

Background for the Study . . . . . 3

The Design . . . . . 3

Findings . . . . . 6

Conclusions and Recommendations. . . . . .11

Appendix A . . . . . .13

Appendix B . . . . . .16

Appendix C . . . . . .16

Appendix D . . . . . .17



TABLE PAGE

1 Change in Scores on Iowa Tests, Test 3 From Pre-Test to Post-Test. . . . . 7

2 Statistics of Cooperative English Test Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores by Group . . . . . 7

3 Analysis of Variance: Sum 1 (Readers) . . . . . 8

4 Analysis of Variance: Sum 2 (Teachers) . . . . . 9

5 Analysis of Variance: Sum 3 (Totals) . . . . . .10

6 Summary Table: Analysis of Variance Among Ratings of Themes 1 and 10 . . . . . .11

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The WSU-Stevens Point Freshman Composition Project was carried out with the valuable aid of several members of the WSU-Stevens Point faculty. Dr. Lee A. Burress, then Chairman of the English Department, originated the project and assisted in the development stages. Dr. William H. Clements, Director of Institutional Research, gave essential guidance at all stages of the project, from the preparation of the design through the preparation of the final report, and especially with the statistical procedures.

Instrumental, of course, to the completion of this project were the teachers who, along with the co-ordinator, planned the syllabus, taught the experimental sections, and developed the data: Mr. Jerome Jennings, Mr. Richard Montgomery, Mrs. Judith Peplinski, Miss Martha F. Shields, and Mrs. Nan Hill Gauthier who became one of the teachers in the project upon the death of Miss Shields in April, 1968.

Summary

The WSU-Stevens Point Freshman English Project was conducted during the 1967-68 academic year. It was designed to test the hypothesis "variation in quantity of practice in writing, when all other relevant factors are held constant, will result in variation in ability to write." Writing was limited to expository writing and the factors held constant were quality of instruction, ability of students, and evaluation procedures on written materials.

Fifteen Freshman English sections were included in the experiment. Five sections, the Minimal Writing Group, wrote 4,000 words in 12 assignments; five, the Average Writing Group, wrote 8,000 words in 20 assignments; and five, the Maximum Writing Group, wrote 16,000 words in 38 assignments. The five teachers taught one section in each Group and all sections had identical instruction with the exception of the number of writing assignments.

To determine the writing ability of the students as the project began and to determine the change in ability at the end, two test were used: Form 1A of the Cooperative English Tests and Form X-35 of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development: Test 3, Correctness and Appropriateness of Expression. Also to determine change in ability to write, ten essays per student were evaluated and rated at equal intervals on a numerical scale by the student's teacher and by a lay reader.

A comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores on the Iowa Test revealed no consistant pattern of change in any of the three groups. A comparison of the scores on the Cooperative English Test revealed that the difference between the pre-test and post-test means was significantly larger beyond the 1/10% level for all three groups. Analysis of variance

among the group means derived from the rating scores assigned by the lay readers revealed significant differences for themes 2, 7, and 10. The mean gain from Theme 1 to Theme 10 was 2.4 for the Minimal Writing Group, 3.9 for the Average Writing Group and 4.3 for the Maximum Writing Group. The same procedure applied to the rating scores assigned by the teachers revealed significant differences for themes 8 and 10. Mean gains from Theme 1 to Theme 10 were 3.9 for the Minimal Writing Group. When the lay readers' and teachers' rating scores were taken together, significant differences were found for themes 7 and 10. The mean gains were 6.1, 7.8 and 8.8 for the Minimal, Average and Maximum Writing Groups respectively. Analysis of variance among ratings of themes 1 and 10 revealed that all three Groups made significant improvement according to the lay readers' and teachers' judgments.

Three conclusions were drawn from the data: (1) writing practice does result in greater ability to write effectively, (2) more opportunities to write result in significantly greater ability to write effectively, and (3) the more writing the better so far as can be determined by a study of this type and these limitations.

## Background for the Study

The purpose of The WSU-Stevens Point Freshman Composition Project was to test the hypothesis "variation in quantity of practice in writing, when all other relevant factors are held constant, will result in variation in ability to write." The term "writing" was defined to mean only "expository writing," which may require such specific types of development as illustration, comparison and contrast, examples, reasons, narration, and definition. The factors to be held constant were quality of instruction, ability of students, and evaluation procedures on written materials. This project was undertaken because the English faculty had never measured objectively the outcomes of the freshman writing program and decisions on how much writing should be assigned were based primarily on how many writing assignments a teacher could read considering the student-teacher ratio. We engaged in this project, then, to determine in an objective manner whether amount of writing experience is in fact a significant factor in ability to write effectively and, if so, to determine the extent of this delimiter. The experiment was begun in September, 1967, and was concluded in June, 1968, at Wisconsin State University-Stevens Point.

## The Design

To test the hypothesis "variation in quantity of practice in writing, when all other relevant factors are held constant, will result in variation in ability to write" 15 sections of Freshman Composition were designated as experimental groups during the 1967-68 academic year. The 15 sections, of some 80 sections offered, were those taught by the five teachers who had agreed to participate in the project. The students in these sections had registered for them without knowing of their

experimental nature.

Form 1A of the Cooperative English Tests was administered during the summer (1967) orientation period and Form X-35 of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development; Test 3, Correctness and Appropriateness of Expression was administered during the first meeting of each section in September, 1967. Both tests were administered for a second time at the end of the experiment, June, 1968. The purposes of the tests were two-fold: (1) to determine the initial writing ability of the students in each of the fifteen sections and (2) to determine the change in ability, if any, by the end of the experiment.

Each of the five teachers taught three experimental sections. One of each teacher's sections was randomly selected to be the "Minimal Writing Section," another to be the "Average Writing Section" and the third section to be the "Maximum Writing Section." The 5 "Minimal Writing Sections," collectively known hereafter as Group "A", wrote during the two semesters approximately 4,000 words in 12 essays; the 5 "Average Writing Sections," Group "B," wrote approximately 8,000 words in 20 essays; the 5 "Maximum Writing Sections," Group "C," wrote approximately 16,000 words in 38 essays (See Appendix A). 8,000 words in 20 essays were chosen for Group "B" because these figures approximate the amount of writing done in the non-experimental Freshman English sections. 4,000 words in 12 essays for Group "A" were chosen because they were the minimum amount possible considering that ten essays were necessary to collect data for the experiment, that an essay at the beginning of the first semester was desirable for diagnostic purposes, and that a research paper is required of all freshmen. 16,000 words in 38 essays were chosen because they represented approximately twice the amount of writing practice that Group "B" would get and because this was the

maximum amount of writing the teachers felt could be effectively handled considering the reading assignments for English that the students would be given, the other demands on the students' time, and, most importantly, the necessity for allowing for sufficient teaching time between writing assignments.

In order to achieve uniformity of instruction, the 5 teachers met weekly throughout the two semesters to plan a day-by-day syllabus based on the general plan which had been developed prior to the beginning of the first semester. Groups "A, "B," and "C" had identical instruction with the single exception of the number of writing assignments.

Two methods of evaluating change in ability to write were decided upon. One method was the pre-test, post-test procedure discussed above. The second method was an evaluation of the essays written during the two semesters. Ten essays per student were rated independently by the student's teacher and by a lay reader. The lay readers were women in the community who had majored in English in college and who had had teaching experience in English at the high school level. The ten essays selected for rating were assigned at approximately equal intervals throughout the two semesters and the assignments were identical for Groups "A," "B," and "C." While only ten essays per student were rated by both the teacher and a reader, all essays were read, "corrected," and returned to the student by the teacher. The students were not aware that some of their essays were being rated in a special manner by lay readers and teachers.

To assure objectivity and uniformity in rating among the teachers and readers, a rating form (see Appendix B) was developed and practice sessions were held before the experiment began. The five qualities of

each essay rated individually were (a) idea, (b) structure, (c) style, (d) diction, and (e) mechanics. To assist the teachers and readers in interpreting each of these qualities, a detailed Checklist for Theme Writing was developed (see Appendix C). Each of the five qualities was rated on a five point scale: (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) average, (4) good, and (5) excellent. The points given for each quality were then added together to produce a total for each essay. The totals given by the teacher and the lay reader on each essay were recorded separately throughout the experiment. A cumulative total, the totals of the teacher and reader added together, was also recorded.

The results of the experiment were based on the performance of 185 students, 63 in the Group "A" sections, 61 in the Group "B" sections, and 61 in the Group "C" sections. Almost twice this many students were originally involved. However, 28 did not take the Co-operative English Test during the summer orientation period; 61 did not return to the appropriate experimental Group second semester; 25 dropped out of school; 67 had incomplete rating data or did not write every assigned essay.

## Findings

Three separate measures of change in writing ability were used. The first was the pre-test and post-test scores on Form X-35 of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development: Test 3, Correctness and Appropriateness of Expression (see Appendix D). A casual comparison of the pre- and post-test scores revealed no consistant pattern of change for any of the three experimental Groups. In Group "A" 27 post-test scores were higher, 29 were lower, and 7 remained the same; in Group "B" 22 were higher, 26 lower, and 13 were the same; in Group "C" 28 were higher, 26

lower, and 7 were the same. These changes are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Change in Scores on Iowa Tests, Test 3
From Pre-test to Post-test

| Group | N | Higher | Lower | No Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 63 | 27 | 29 | 7 |
| B | 61 | 22 | 26 | 13 |
| C | 61 | 28 | 26 | 7 |

The second measure of change in writing ability was a comparison of pre-and post-test scores on Form 1A of the Cooperative English Test. "Table 2" summarized the results.

TABLE 2

Statistics of Cooperative English Test Pre-Test
and Post-Test Scores by Group

| Group | N | Pre-Test | Post-Test | Critical Ratio of Difference in Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 63 | 158.24 | 161.30 | 5.566 |
| B | 61 | 154.95 | 158.38 | 6.226 |
| C | 61 | 157.33 | 160.25 | 5.696 |

P(C.R. 3.30, 60 d.f.) = .001

The difference between the pre-test and post-test means is significant beyond the 1/10% level for all three Groups. It should be noted here, as in the tables which follow, that Group "A," the Minimal Writing Group, and Group "C," the Maximum Writing Group, were nearly equal in measured writing ability at the beginning of the experiment while Group "B," the Average Writing Group, was somewhat lower in measured writing ability.

The third measure of change in ability to write effectively was based on the rating scores of ten essays per student assigned by the lay

readers and by the teachers. Table 3 compares the changes in each Group's ability as indicated by the scores assigned by the lay readers.

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance: Sum 1 (Readers)

| Theme | Group Means A | B | C | F Ratio | Level of Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 13.3 | 12.3 | 13.6 | 0.39 | -- |
| 2 | 14.2 | 14.1 | 15.5 | 3.17 | 5% |
| 3 | 14.7 | 14.9 | 16.3 | 3.27 | -- |
| 4 | 15.3 | 13.6 | 15.3 | 2.52 | -- |
| 5 | 15.8 | 15.2 | 15.8 | 0.35 | -- |
| 6 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 15.3 | 1.56 | -- |
| 7 | 13.1 | 13.0 | 15.4 | 4.89 | 1% |
| 8 | 16.4 | 15.4 | 16.5 | 1.08 | -- |
| 9 | 15.3 | 15.2 | 16.0 | 0.46 | -- |
| 10 | 15.7 | 16.1 | 17.9 | 4.48 | 5% |
| Mean Gain: Theme 1 to Theme 10: | 2.4 | 3.9 | 4.3 | | |

Analysis of variance among the Group means derived from the scores assigned by the lay readers shows a significant difference at the 5% level for theme 2, a significant difference at the 1% level for theme 7, and a significant difference at the 5% level for theme 10. The means for each Group generally are progressively higher, the major exceptions being on themes 6 and 7, especially for the Minimal and Average Writing Groups. Theme 6 was the first essay rated after the semester break; Theme 7 was rated 3½ weeks later. This table indicates, as did "Table 2," that Group "B"'s level of performance was from the outset somewhat below that of the other two Groups. The lay readers' scores produced a mean gain from Theme 1 to Theme 10 of 2.4 for the Minimal Writing Group, 3.9 for the Average Writing Group, and 4.3 for the Maximum Writing Group. The significant differences on themes 2, 7 and 10 and the differences in the

mean gains support the hypothesis that variation in quantity of practice in writing will result in variation in ability to write. In the judgment of the lay readers, the gains in writing ability were in direct relationship to the quantity of practice.

"Table 4" compares the changes in each Group's ability as indicated by the scores assigned by the teachers.

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance: Sum 2 (Teachers)

| | Group Means | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Theme | A | B | C | F Ratio | Level of Significance |
| 1 | 10.0 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 0.39 | -- |
| 2 | 12.8 | 12.1 | 12.9 | 1.18 | -- |
| 3 | 14.0 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 0.50 | -- |
| 4 | 14.4 | 13.9 | 14.1 | 0.39 | -- |
| 5 | 14.4 | 14.0 | 14.2 | 0.20 | -- |
| 6 | 13.0 | 13.3 | 13.6 | 0.57 | -- |
| 7 | 13.3 | 13.7 | 13.9 | 0.46 | -- |
| 8 | 14.9 | 13.6 | 13.5 | 3.61 | 5% |
| 9 | 14.2 | 12.9 | 14.0 | 2.53 | -- |
| 10 | 14.0 | 14.3 | 15.4 | 3.33 | 5% |
| Mean Gain Theme 1 to Theme 10: | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.8 | | |

Analysis of variance among the Group means derived from the scores assigned by the teachers reveals that the teachers found significant differences at the 5% level on themes 8 and 10. Like the lay readers, the teachers judged the level of performance of the Average Writing Group to be generally below that of the other two Groups. The teachers' scores produced identical mean gains, 3.9, from Theme 1 to Theme 10, for Groups "A" and "B," while the mean gain for Group "C" was 4.8. These gains are similar to those seen on "Table 3" (the readers' results) for Groups "B" and "C" but is greater of Group "A", the Minimal Writing Group, than the lay readers' scores produced.

"Table 5" summarizes the differences found among the Groups when the scores of the lay readers and the teachers are taken together.

TABLE 5

Analysis of Variance: Sum 3 (Totals)

| Theme | A | B | C | F Ratio | Level of Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 23.4 | 22.9 | 24.0 | 0.49 | -- |
| 2 | 27.0 | 26.2 | 28.4 | 1.75 | -- |
| 3 | 28.4 | 28.4 | 29.5 | 0.82 | -- |
| 4 | 29.7 | 27.6 | 29.4 | 1.80 | -- |
| 5 | 30.2 | 29.2 | 29.8 | 0.37 | -- |
| 6 | 27.0 | 27.3 | 28.9 | 1.71 | -- |
| 7 | 26.4 | 26.6 | 29.3 | 3.37 | 5% |
| 8 | 31.3 | 29.1 | 30.0 | 1.72 | -- |
| 9 | 29.5 | 28.1 | 30.0 | 1.18 | -- |
| 10 | 29.5 | 30.7 | 32.8 | 3.97 | 5% |
| Mean Gain: Theme 1 to Theme 10 | 6.1 | 7.8 | 8.8 | | |

The differences among the groups are significant at the 5% level for themes 7 and 10. The general trend appears to be toward greater differences as the experiment progressed although Theme 5 is a notable exception and themes 8 and 9 reveal a partial reversal of the trend. The mean gain from Theme 1 to Theme 10 reveals that the amount of gain was in direct relationship to amount of writing: the Minimal Writing Group (A) gained 6.1, the Average Writing Group (B) gained 7.8, and the Maximum Writing Group (C) gained 8.8.

Table 6 summarizes the changes in ratings by lay reader and teachers when Theme 1 is compared to Theme 10 in each Group. The table again uses the mean scores for each Group.

SUMMARY TABLE: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
AMONG RATINGS OF THEMES 1 AND 10

| GROUP | THEME 1 | THEME 10 | *F RATIO | **C.R. | LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A-Sum 1 | 13.26 | 15.71 | 5.769 | 2.403 | 5% |
| B-Sum 1 | 12.30 | 16.08 | 22.429 | 4.737 | 1/10% |
| C-Sum 1 | 13.5 | 17.91 | 26.357 | 5.134 | 1/10% |
| A-Sum 2 | 10.13 | 13.98 | 50.773 | 7.127 | 1/10% |
| B-Sum 2 | 10.43 | 14.33 | 55.270 | 7.437 | 1/10% |
| C-Sum 2 | 10.61 | 15.42 | 50.000 | 7.073 | 1/10% |
| A-Total | 23.39 | 29.50 | 32.019 | 5.659 | 1/10% |
| B-Total | 22.88 | 30.69 | 47.597 | 6.899 | 1/10% |
| C-Total | 24.03 | 32.78 | 51.665 | 5.908 | 1/10% |

*SIGNIFICANT F VALUES
5% level -- 3.92
1% level -- 6.85
1/10% level --11.38

**SIGNIFICANT C.R.
5% level -- 1.96
1% level -- 2.58
1/10% level -- 3.30

This table reveals that all three Groups made significant improvement from Theme 1 to Theme 10 according to the lay readers' judgments (Sum 1), the teachers' judgments (Sum 2), and the judgments of the two taken together (Total).

## Conclusions and Recommendations

Analysis of the data derived from the Cooperative English Test and from the rating of essays throughout the experimental year results in these conclusions: (1) writing practice does result in greater ability to write effectively as measured by test scores and by improved mean scores of theme ratings, and (2) more opportunities to write result in significantly greater ability to write effectively as measured by comparing the rating scores on essays near the end of the experimental period, and by observing the mean gains of the groups.

These two conclusions suggest that a freshman composition course is of value if effective writing is a goal of university education. Since amount of improvement seems to be directly related to amount of writing,

freshman composition courses should be planned so as to include many opportunities to write.

In view of the evidence obtained from this investigation, the best answer to the question "How much writing?" is, "The more the better so far as can be determined by a study of this type and these limitations." Specifically, it does appear desirable to have composition students write as much as 16,000 words in as many as 38 assignments.

While this study suggests that a writing program with many opportunities to write results in more effective writing, several questions remain unanswered: (1) Would more writing than was done in this experiment benefit the student? (2) Is the improvement permanent? (3) Are the variations in ability which are caused by variation in amount of writing permanent? (4) Is there a carry-over from the composition course to other courses? Research which seeks to answer any of these questions would be valuable.

## APPENDIX A

### Writing Assignments

Essay assignments fro Groups "A," "B" and "C" by subject, type and length. Assignments with an asterisk (*) are the rated essays.

### Semester I

| | GROUP C<br>16,000 words: 38 essays | GROUP B<br>8,000 words:<br>20 essays | GROUP A<br>4,000 words:<br>12 essays |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | "Personal opinions of dissent," | 1. Same | 1. Same |
| *2. | "Influential persons," illustration, 300 words | *2. Same | *2. Same |
| 3. | "Why I hate _____," reasons, 500 words | | |
| 4. | "What is a _____," definition, 300 words | | |
| 5. | "Favorite place, " description, 400 words | 3. Same | |
| *6. | "Something I've Changed My Mind About Since I Came to College," reasons/description, 300 words | *4. Same | *3. Same |
| 7. | "Democracy, socialism, justice, or freedom," extended definition, 500 words | 5. Same | |
| 8. | "Development of 'Dover Beach," analysis, 400 words | | |
| 9. | "Patriotism," examples, 300 words | | |
| *10. | "Campus Clods," examples, 300 words | *6. Same | *4. Same |
| 11. | "Use of detail in 'The Body Politic,'" reasons, 400 words | | |
| 12. | "Description of self from someone else's point of view," description, 500 words | 7. Same | |

APPENDIX A, Writing Assignments, continued

| Group C | Group B | Group A |
|---|---|---|
| 13. "An experience and what you learned from it," narration/ explanation, 500 words | | |
| *14. "A modern symbol, i.e., dark glasses, Cadillac, lunch pail," illustration/examples, 300 words | *8. Same | *5. Same |
| 15. "Theme of 'Ozymandias,'" evidence, 400 words | | |
| 16. Personal view of old age, reasons, 300 words | 9. Same | |
| *17. "Personal view of war," evidence to support a thesis, 300 words | *10 Same | *6. Same |
| **Semester II** | | |
| 18. "Character sketch of a one-dimensional character," description, 400 words | | |
| 19. "Character in 'The Open Boat,'" subjective description, 400 words | 11. Same | |
| 20. "Suggestive sedcription in 'Flowering Judas,'" analysis/ description, 500 words | | |
| *21 "Character in Daisy Miller," analysis, 300 words | *12. Same | *7. Same |
| 22. "Settings in 'Teresa,'" comparison and contrast, 400 words | | |
| 23. "Light and Dark in Heart of Darkness," comparison and contrast, 500 words | 13. Same | |
| 24. "Setting in Heart of Darkness," comparison and contrast, 400 words | | |
| *25. "Gabriel Conroy and Frederick Winterbourne," comparison and contrast, 300 words | *14. Same | *8. Same |

APPENDIX A, Writing Assignments, continued

| Group C | Group B | Group A |
|---|---|---|
| 26. Unifying devices in Winesburg, Ohio, analysis, 300 words | | |
| 27. Use of setting in Winesburg, Ohio, illustration, 400 words | | |
| 28. Research paper on Winesburg, Ohio, 2,000 words | 15. Same 1,200 words | 9. Same 700 words |
| *29. Characterization in Troilus and Cressida, analysis, 300 words | *16. Same | *10. Same |
| 30. "Pride," exemplification, 500 words | | |
| 31. "Leisure Time," classification, 300 words | | |
| 32. "Symbol in 'The Hint of an Explanation,'" evidence, 500 words | 17. Same | |
| 33. "Humility," illustration 400 words | | |
| *34. "A theme in Troilus and Cressida," evidence, 300 words | *18. Same | *11. Same |
| 35. "View of personal responsibility in All My Sons, examples, 400 words | | |
| 36. "Development of 'Ars Poetica,'" analysis, 400 words | 19. Same | |
| 37. "Tone of 'War Is Kind,'" evidence to support thesis 400 words | | |
| *38. "Attitude toward literature," method of development is optional, 300 words | *20. Same | *12. Same |

APPENDIX B

Facsimile of the rating form used in the evaluation of ten essays per student.

Rating Form

Theme No. _____

Student No. _____

Reader _____

Total _____

1. poor
2. fair
3. average
4. good
5. excellent

(1) Idea _____

(2) Structure_____

(3) Style _____

(4) Diction_____

(5) Mechanics_____

APPENDIX C

Facsimile of the Checklist for Theme Writing which was used to define the five categories on the Rating Form.

Checklist for Theme Writing

1. Idea
   - A. A point is made (a central idea)
   - B. Freshness of ideas
   - C. Adequacy of detail
   - D. Clearly defined detail
   - E. Suitable length

2. Structure
   - A. Unity (all materials are relevant to the central idea)
     - (1) Thesis statement
     - (2) Restriction of subject
   - B. Coherence (progression of idea, logical movement)
     - (1) Topic sentences
     - (2) Transitional devices

(3) Introduction
(4) Conclusion ( a suitable ending)

C. Emphasis
D. Paragraph development

3. Style
   A. Freshness of approach
   B. Appropriateness of style to subject
   C. Precision of expression
   D. Sensitivity, sincerity
   E. Variety of sentence structures

4. Diction
   A. Range of vocabulary
   B. Effectiveness of allusions
   C. Clarity
   D. Effectiveness of metaphors
   E. Economy
   F. Ease of expression (as opposed to awkward or clumsy expression)

5. Mechanics (deduct 1 point for every 2 errors)
   A. Sentence fragment
   B. Comma Splice
   C. Fused sentence
   D. Lack of agreement of subject and verb
   E. Wrong verb form
   F. Lack of agreement or clear reference of pronouns
   G. Wrong pronoun case
   H. Dangling modifier
   I. Wrong plural forms
   J. A phrase or subordinate clause set off with a semicolon
   K. Misspelling or confusion in the use of simple words like "to" and "too," "its" and "it's" "their" and "there".
   L. Any garbled or incoherent sentence
   M. Spelling errors (in addition to those in "K" above)
   N. Errors in use of apostrophe
   O. Error in use of capital letters
   P. Error in use of punctuation marks

## APPENDIX D

Test Scores: The Iowa Test Of Educational Development, Test 3

| GROUP A | GROUP B | GROUP C |
|---|---|---|
| Pre - Post | Pre - Post | Pre - Post |
| 26 --- 21 | 26 --- 24 | 28 --- 29 |
| 26 --- 21 | 26 --- 27 | 27 --- 25 |
| 26 --- 24 | 25 --- 26 | 2[illegible] --- 23 |
| 26 --- 26 | 24 --- 19 | 26 --- 26 |
| 26 --- 26 | 24 --- 20 | 25 --- 22 |

| GROUP A | GROUP B | GROUP C |
|---|---|---|
| Pre - Post | Pre - Post | Pre - Post |
| 25 --- 19 | 24 --- 24 | 24 --- 20 |
| 25 --- 24 | 24 --- 26 | 24 --- 27 |
| 25 --- 26 | 22 --- 20 | 23 --- 18 |
| 25 --- 26 | 22 --- 20 | 23 --- 24 |
| 24 --- 19 | 22 --- 22 | 22 --- 13 |
| 24 --- 21 | 22 --- 27 | 22 --- 20 |
| 24 --- 22 | 21 --- 19 | 22 --- 20 |
| 24 --- 23 | 21 --- 19 | 22 --- 20 |
| 24 --- 24 | 21 --- 21 | 22 --- 21 |
| 24 --- 26 | 21 --- 21 | 21 --- 16 |
| 22 --- 21 | 21 --- 22 | 21 --- 18 |
| 22 --- 24 | 21 --- 23 | 21 --- 19 |
| 21 --- 19 | 21 --- 23 | 21 --- 19 |
| 21 --- 19 | 20 --- 13 | 21 --- 19 |
| 21 --- 20 | 20 --- 15 | 21 --- 20 |
| 21 --- 21 | 20 --- 22 | 21 --- 21 |
| 21 --- 24 | 19 --- 15 | 21 --- 21 |
| 21 --- 24 | 19 --- 15 | 21 --- 21 |
| 21 --- 24 | 19 --- 17 | 21 --- 23 |
| 20 --- 19 | 19 --- 18 | 21 --- 24 |
| 20 --- 19 | 19 --- 18 | 19 --- 18 |
| 20 --- 22 | 19 --- 19 | 19 --- 18 |
| 20 --- 23 | 19 --- 19 | 19 --- 20 |
| 20 --- 24 | 19 --- 20 | 18 --- 16 |
| 19 --- 17 | 18 --- 14 | 18 --- 17 |
| 19 --- 18 | 18 --- 14 | 18 --- 17 |
| 19 --- 19 | 18 --- 17 | 18 --- 18 |
| 19 --- 25 | 18 --- 18 | 18 --- 19 |
| 18 --- 11 | 18 --- 18 | 18 --- 19 |
| 18 --- 17 | 18 --- 19 | 18 --- 19 |
| 18 --- 17 | 18 --- 19 | 18 --- 19 |
| 18 --- 19 | 18 --- 22 | 18 --- 21 |
| 18 --- 20 | 18 --- 24 | 17 --- 13 |
| 18 --- 21 | 17 --- 13 | 17 --- 16 |
| 18 --- 22 | 17 --- 14 | 17 --- 16 |
| 18 --- 23 | 17 --- 15 | 17 --- 18 |
| 17 --- 13 | 17 --- 16 | 17 --- 18 |
| 17 --- 13 | 17 --- 18 | 17 --- 18 |
| 17 --- 18 | 17 --- 19 | 17 --- 18 |
| 17 --- 18 | 17 --- 21 | 17 --- 19 |
| 17 --- 18 | 16 --- 13 | 17 --- 19 |
| 17 --- 19 | 16 --- 17 | 17 --- 21 |
| 17 --- 19 | 15 --- 13 | 17 --- 24 |
| 16 --- 16 | 15 --- 15 | 16 --- 14 |
| 16 --- 20 | 15 --- 15 | 15 --- 15 |
| 15 --- 13 | 14 --- 13 | 15 --- 15 |
| 15 --- 14 | 14 --- 13 | 15 --- 16 |
| 15 --- 14 | 14 --- 14 | 15 --- 16 |
| 15 --- 18 | 14 --- 14 | 15 --- 17 |
| 15 --- 21 | 14 --- 16 | 15 --- 18 |
| 14 --- 13 | 14 --- 18 | 14 --- 17 |
| 14 --- 13 | 13 --- 12 | 14 --- 17 |
| 13 --- 12 | 13 --- 13 | 14 --- 18 |
| 13 --- 15 | 10 --- 16 | 13 --- 17 |
| 13 --- 16 | | |
| 7 --- 14 | | |